

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-36 are pending in this application. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 16-19, 31, and 33-36 and objected to claims 5-15, 20-30, and 32, but indicated these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim. By this paper, Applicants amend claims 1, 5, 11, 16, 19, 20, 26, 31-34, and 36. Applicants have also amended the specification to properly reference the revised drawings attached herewith and to correct grammatical and typographical errors.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The Examiner states that the Information Disclosure Statement filed on April 15, 2004, fails to comply with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. 1.97 and 1.98, because it was submitted with a non-English reference titled "Datenarchivierung mit SAP." Applicants are attaching an English-language translation of the document and respectfully request that the Examiner consider the information therein and initial the IDS to indicate consideration.

### ***Title of the Invention***

The Examiner objected to the title of the invention as purportedly not being sufficiently specific as to differentiate the invention from similar inventions in the patent literature. Applicants have amended the title to more specifically reflect the subject matter of the invention.

### ***Cross-Reference to Related Applications***

In response to the Examiner's suggestion, Applicants have amended the specification to include more specific information about the related patent applications and to correct the heading.

### ***Amendments to the Drawings***

In response to the Examiner's suggestion, Applicants have amended Figs. 3–9.

Applicants have amended Fig. 6 to show assigning an identifier (ID) of a first type to the selected data object (612), and assigning an ID of a second type to the selected data object (611). In addition, Applicants have amended the specification to include proper references to the revised figures.

With respect to storing the first type ID in a first lock object and storing the second-type ID in a second lock object, Applicants respectfully submit that those features were already shown in Fig. 3, at 307 and 302, respectively. Applicants refer Examiner to paragraph 0035 (“first type lock object called the ‘persistent lock object;’” “second type lock object named ‘transactional lock object[.]’”) and paragraph 0043 (“[S]etting a P- or T-lock for a selected object means to store an ID of that object in a respective lock object.”). However, in the interest of clarity, Applicants have amended the language of the relevant descriptions in Figs. 3, 4, and 6–9.

Applicants respectfully submit that deleting the second type ID from the second lock object after the storing of the data object in the second storage location was already shown at least in Fig. 4 at 407. However, in the interest of clarity, Applicants have amended the language of the relevant descriptions in Figs. 3, 4, and 6–9.

Applicants respectfully submit that deleting the first type ID from the first lock object after the storing of the data object in the second storage location was already shown at least in Fig. 5 at 503. However, in the interest of clarity, Applicants have amended the language of the relevant descriptions in Figs. 3, 4, and 6–9.

***Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101***

The Examiner rejected claims 31–34 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as purportedly containing nonstatutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection as to all four claims. However, to further prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 31 and 32 to include “when executed by a processor,” as suggested by the Examiner.

With respect to claim 33, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s assertion that a carrier wave is not statutory subject matter because it is purportedly “not a tangible embodiment.” MPEP § 2106(IV)(B)(1)(c) states, in part, that “a signal claim directed to a practical application of electromagnetic energy is statutory regardless of its transitory nature.” (citing *O’Reilly v. Morse*, 56 U.S. 62, 114–19; *In re Breslow*, 616 F.2d 516, 519–21, 205 U.S.P.Q. 221, 225–26 (CCPA 1980)). Claim 33 accords with this guideline in that it recites an electromagnetic signal (“a carrier wave”) and its and practical applications (“moving a data object . . .,” etc.).

The Examiner did not cite any specific defect in claim 34 and Applicants fail to see any reason, based on MPEP § 2106 or elsewhere, that would invalidate such a method claim.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claims 31–34 are in condition for allowance and request that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection be withdrawn as to each.

***Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 16-19, 31, and 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/005625 A1 (“Richard”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0004975 A1 (“Nakano”).

With this paper, Applicants amend claims 1, 16, 31, 33, 34, and 36 to include subject matter similar to original claim 11, which was identified in the Examiner in the Office Action as allowable subject matter. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 16, 31, 33, 34, and 36, as amended, are allowable.

Claims 2–4 depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 17–19 depend from claim 16 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 16.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s rejection as to claim 35. Claim 35 contains subject matter similar to the subject matter of claim 5, which was already identified by the Examiner at page 9 of the Office Action as allowable. Furthermore, neither Richard nor Nakano teaches using more than one type of ID. Specifically, neither Richard nor Nakano teach “assigning an ID of a second type . . . ,” “storing the second type ID . . . ,” or “deleting the second type ID . . . ” as recited in claim 35 of the present application. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claim 35 is allowable.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

The Examiner objected to claims 5-15, 20-30, and 32, as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that those claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and if all remaining claim objections and rejections were overcome. Applicants have amended claims 5, 11, 20, 26 and 32 as suggested and submit that claims 5-11, 22, 26, and 32, as amended, are in condition for immediate allowance.

Claims 6-10, 12, and 14 depend from claim 5 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 5. Claims 13 and 15 depend from claim 11 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 11. Claims 21-25, 27, and 29 depend from claim 20 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons as claim 20. Claims 28 and 30 depend from claim 26 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 26.

### CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance and request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of all pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: May 23, 2006

By:   
Linda J Thayer  
Reg. No. 45,681

**Attachments:**      **Replacement Sheets of Figs. 3-9**  
                             **Annotated Sheets of Figs. 3-9 showing changes**